arXiv:1210.2046v1 [gr-qc] 7 Oct 2012

Acceleration of particles by quasiblack holes

O. B. Zaslavskii

Kharkov V.N. Karazin National University,
4 Svoboda Square, Kharkov, 61077, Ukraine[*]

If two particles collide near the black hole horizon, the energy in the centre of mass (CM) frame can grow indefinitely (the so-called the BSW effect). This requires fine-tuning the parameters (the energy, angular momentum or electric charge) of one particle. We show that the CM energy can be unbound also for collisions in the space-time of quasiblack holes - QBHs (the objects on the threshold of forming the horizon which do not collapse). It does not require special fine-tuning of parameters and occurs when any particle inside a QBH having a finite energy collides with the particle that entered a QBH from the outside region.

PACS numbers: 04.70.Bw, 97.60.Lf

I. INTRODUCTION

If two particles collide near the black hole horizon, the energy in their centre of mass (CM) frame can grow indefinitely. This interesting effect was discovered by Bañados, SIlk and West [1] and is called the BSW effect after the names of its authors and is under active study now. To achieve this effect, the collision by itself is insufficient. Additionally, one of particles has to have fine-tuned parameters, so that the some relationship between its energy and angular momentum or charge should hold. This somewhat restricts the realization of the BSW effect or requires special scenarios like collisions near circular orbits (that can occur in the accretion disc) [2]. The aim of the present work is point out that there exists one more class of objects - so-called quasblack holes (QBH) - for which the BSW effect can reveal itself. What is especially interesting is that for QBHs no fine-tuning is required at all, so the BSW effect is even more universal in this sense than one could think before. QBH is

---

[*]Electronic address: zaslav@ukr.net

an object, roughly speaking, on the verge of collapsing and forming the event horizon but without actual forming the horizon. This includes a quite diverse set of physical objects: the self-gravitating monopole, so-called extremal dust and even a usual thin shell in the near-horizon limit (see [3] and references therein for more strict definition and discussion of general properties).

In the present paper I restrict myself with the radial motion of charged particles in spherically symmetric metric that represents the counterpart of similar kind of the BSW effect for rotating black holes [5]. Meanwhile, the rotational analogue of QBHs also exists [4], so the results can be extended to it in a straightforward manner.

II. BSW EFFECT FOR BLACK HOLES

Let us remind the main ingredients of the BSW effect for charged spherically symmetric black holes [5]. The metric can be written in the form

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{A(r)} + r^2 d\omega^2. \tag{1}$$

In the particular case of the Reissner-Nordströn (RN) metric $f = A = 1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{Q^2}{r^2}$ where M is the mass of the black hole, Q is its charge, the electric potential $\varphi = \frac{Q}{r}$. We use the systems of units in which the fundamental constants $G = c =\hbar=1.$. I consider, for definiteness, the extremal case, so for the RN black hole $M = Q = r_+$ where r_+ is the horizon radius, $f = \left(1 - \frac{r_+}{r}\right)^2$. The equations of motion give us

$$mu^0 = m\dot{t} = \frac{1}{f}(E - q\varphi), \tag{2}$$

$$m^2\dot{r}^2 = \frac{A}{f}(E - q\varphi)^2 - m^2 A, \tag{3}$$

where dot denotes derivative with respect to the proper time of a moving particle.

Then, one can define the energy in the CM frame $E_{c.m.}$ according to $E_{c.m.}^2 = -P^\mu P_\mu$ where $P^\mu = p_1^\mu + p_2^\mu$ is the total momentum, p^μ are individual ones of particles, subscript i enumerates particles' characteristics ($i = 1, 2$). Assuming for simplicity that $m_1 = m_2 = m$, one finds that

$$\frac{E_{cm}^2}{2m^2} = 1 + \frac{X_1 X_2 - Z_1 Z_2}{N^2 m^2} \tag{4}$$

where

$$X_i = E_i - q_i\varphi,\ Z_i = \sqrt{X_i^2 - m^2N^2} \tag{5}$$

and we introduce the lapse function, $f = N^2$.

Let particle 1 be critical and particle be usual. By definition, this means that $(X_1)_+ = 0$, hereafter subscript "+" denotes quantities calculated on the horizon. Then,

$$E_1 = q_1\varphi(r_+) \tag{6}$$

and $(X_2)_+ \neq 0$. If $(X_1)_+$ does not vanish exactly but is small in some sense (see below), we will call such a particle "near-critical".

Near the horizon, we can use the Taylor expansion for the potential $\varphi \approx \varphi(r_+)[1 - a\frac{(r-r_+)}{r_+}] + O((r-r_+)^2)$ and the lapse function $N \approx b\frac{(r-r_+)}{r_+}$ where we took into account that for the extremal horizon, by definition, $f \sim (r-r_+)^2$. In the RN case, the constants $a = b = 1$.

Then, if is easy to obtain from (5), (6) that for a critical particle

$$X_1 \approx \frac{a}{b}E_1N, \tag{7}$$

near the horizon.

Then, in the limit $f \rightarrow 0$ one can find that

$$E_{cm}^2 \approx \frac{2X_{2(H)}}{N}[\frac{a}{b}E_1 - \sqrt{(\frac{a}{b})^2E_1^2 - m^2}]. \tag{8}$$

Thus the CM energy grows unbound that gives us the BSW effect.

III. CASE OF QUASIBLACK HOLES

Let us consider a compact body for which $N(r_B) = \varepsilon$ is small on the boundary $r = r_B$. We assume that inside $(r < r_B)$

$$N = \varepsilon\tilde{N}(r) \tag{9}$$

where $\tilde{N}(r) \neq 0$, $\tilde{N}(r_B) = 1$ because of continuity of the metric on the boundary. Eq. (4) is still valid. Inside, one can introduce a new time coordinate according to $\tilde{t} = \varepsilon t$. Then, in the inner region the metric takes the form

$$ds^2 = -\tilde{N}^2(r)d\tilde{t}^2 + \frac{dr^2}{A(r)} + r^2d\omega^2. \tag{10}$$

The small parameter ε is eliminated, so $\tilde{t}$ is a natural measure of time in the inner region.

Let particle 2 enter the inner region (say, from infinity) and collide there with particle 1. We assume that particle 2 was created *inside* the boundary and has some finite energy $\tilde{E}$ measured with respect to the *inner time* $\tilde{t}$. As the energy is a time component of the four-vector, $E = \tilde{E}\frac{\partial \tilde{t}}{\partial t} = \varepsilon \tilde{E}$. In a similar way, $\varphi = \varepsilon \tilde{\varphi}$. As a result, $X_1 = \varepsilon \tilde{X}_1$ where $\tilde{X}_1$ does not contain a small parameter.

It is clear from the formulas of the previous Section that it is smallness of $(X_1)_+$ that causes indefinite growth of $E_{c.m.}$. But this is just what happens now! Indeed, it follows from (4) that

$$E_{cm}^2 \approx \frac{X_{2(H)}}{\varepsilon \tilde{N}}[\tilde{X}_1 - \sqrt{\tilde{X}_1^2 - m^2 \tilde{N}^2}]. \tag{11}$$

Therefore, if $\varepsilon \ll 1$, E_{cm}^2 can be made as large as one likes.

IV. DISCUSSION: COMPARISON OF TWO KINDS OF THE BSW EFFECT

The existence of the BSW effects for black holes is due to the horizon: the metric function $f = 0$ at some point $r = r_+$. By contrast, in the QBH case, the metric function does not vanish at all. Instead, it remains small but nonzero in the entire region $r \leq r_B$. Correspondingly, the BSW effect can occur there not only near the would-be horizon (like near the horizon of black holes) but *everywhere* inside. Actually, this is nontrivial consequence of mismatch between the time coordinates inside and outside that is important property of QBH [3].

We saw in the preceding Section that $X_1 \to 0$ for any typical particle created inside. In this sense, any such particle is near-critical. Meanwhile, particle 2 is usual, so the main condition of the BSW effect is satisfied. It is worth stressing that this condition is obtained without fine-tuning at all, so *any* particle inside with a finite energy $\tilde{E}$ is near-critical. As particle 2 is chosen to be usual, their collision leads to the BSW effect.

It is also instructive to describe the situation in a kinematic language. For black holes, a critical particle approaches the horizon with some finite velocity $V_1 < 1$ measured by a static or stationary observer. Any usual particle has $V_2 \to 1$ near the horizon. As a result, the relative velocity of two particles $w \to 1$, the corresponding Lorentz gamma factor indefinitely grows and $E_{c.m.} \to \infty$ (see [6] for details).

For radial motion in the metric (1), $V=\frac{dl}{d\tau_{st}}$ where dl is the proper distance and $d\tau_{st}=fdt$ is the proper time measured by a static observer in a given point. Using (1), one finds

$$V=\frac{|\dot{r}|}{\sqrt{r^{2}+A}}, \tag{12}$$

In the inner region, $\tilde{N}$ and $\tilde{A}$ should be used here instead of N and A.

In the black hole case (say, for the RN metric), $A\sim f\rightarrow 0$ near the horizon. If particle is usual, $\dot{r}^{2}\neq 0$ due to the first term in the right hand side of (3), so $V\rightarrow 1$ for a usual particle. In a similar way, for the critical one, $\dot{r}^{2}\sim N^{2}\rightarrow 0$ and we have from (12) that $V_{1}<1$.

For QBHs the situation is somewhat different. The quantity A is small near the boundary from the outside but is finite nonzero in the inner region (say, we can take Minkowski vacuum inside and the RN metric outside) [3]. The quantity $N\sim \varepsilon$ is small inside. Let us consider the process from the viewpoint of an observer who resides inside the boundary r_{B} and uses time $\tilde{t}$. Particle 1 created just inside with the finite energy $\tilde{E}$, has also finite $\dot{r}$, $\tilde{N}$, $\tilde{A}$. As a result, $V_{1}<1$. From the other hand, for a generic particle 2 it follows from eq. (3) that $|\dot{r}|\rightarrow\infty$ since A is finite but $f\sim\varepsilon^{2}$ is small in the inner region. Therefore, it follows from (12) that $V_{2}\rightarrow 1$. Thus, the mechanisms that give rise to $V_{1}<1$, $V_{2}\rightarrow 1$ in both cases are different but the result is the same: the BSW effect due to the relative velocity approaching the speed of light.

Thus, we obtained by different methods that particle 1 in this context is always near-critical, so due to the collision between a near-critical and usual particles the BSW effect occurs.

The situation for which the BSW effect occurs can be summarized in the table.

Particle	Origination	E	$\tilde{E}$	V inside	$\lvert\dot{r}\rvert$ inside	Type
1	created inside	$\sim\varepsilon$	finite	<1	finite	near-critical
2	coming from outside	finite	$\sim 1/\varepsilon$	≈ 1	$\sim 1/\varepsilon$	usual

It is worth mentioning that a quite different mechanism for the BSW effect for regular space-times without horizons was considered in [7]. It applies to pure radial motion of uncharged particles, required some special limitations on the velocities and angular momentums and leads to the dependence $E_{cm}^{2}\sim f^{-1}=N^{-2}$ whereas in our case $E_{cm}^{2}\sim N^{-1}$ and the only physical requirement is the smallness of the parameter ε.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Thus we extended the class of objects which can be sources of the BSW effect. In addition to extremal [1] or nonextremal [8] black holes and naked singularities [9], quasiblack holes are added and the mechanism of creating the BSW effect is analyzed. It turned out that the BSW effect may occur not only near the distinct surfaces but in the entire region. In so doing, there is no need to achieve fine-tuning by special selection of the particles for obtaining critical ones which are necessary for the BSW effect. Therefore, the results obtained look quite universal and can be useful in the analysis of physics of relativistic objects which are close to the stage of gravitational collapse. In the present paper we restricted ourselves by radial motion in the background of spherically symmetric QBHs. Meanwhile, the rotating analogue of QBH appears naturally in astrophysics of rapidly rotating objects (see [10] and references therein). Correspondingly, the BSW effect should occur also for rotating QBHs.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Cosmomicrophysics section of the Programme of the Space Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

[1] M. Bañados, J. Silk, S.M. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 111102.

[2] T. Harada and M. Kimura, Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011) 024002; O. B. Zaslavskii, Classical Quantum Gravity 29 (2012) 205004.

[3] J. P. S. Lemos and O. B. Zaslavskii, Phys. Rev. D 76, 084030 (2007).

[4] J. P. S. Lemos and O. B. Zaslavskii, Phys. Rev. D 79, 044020 (2009).

[5] O. B. Zaslavskii, Pis'ma v Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 92, 635 (2010) (JETP Lett. 92 (2010) 571).

[6] O. B. Zaslavskii, Phys. Rev. D 84 (2011) 024007.

[7] M. Patil and P. S. Joshi, Phys. Rev. D 86, 044040 (2012).

[8] A. A. Grib and Y.V. Pavlov, Pis'ma v Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 92 (2010) 147 [JETP Lett. 92 (2010) 147].

[9] M. Patil and P. S. Joshi, Phys. Rev. D 82, 104049 (2010).

[10] R. Meinel, Classical Quantum Gravity 23, 1359 (2006).